REMARKS

The specification has been amended. Claims 1, 4 - 5, 8, and 10 have been amended. Claims 3, 9, and 11 have been cancelled from the application without prejudice. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments, which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claims 1 - 2, 3 - 8, and 10 remain in the application.

I. Drawing Corrections

As discussed above in "Amendments to the Drawings", proposed replacement drawings are submitted herewith for **Figs. 7** and **10A**. No new matter is introduced.

II. Double-Patenting Rejection

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action dated July 1, 2004 (hereinafter, "the Office Action") states that Claims 1, 2, and 6 are provisionally rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of co-pending Application No. 09/669,227. Paragraphs 4 - 6 of the Office Action state that Claims 1 and 2 are also provisionally rejected under this doctrine in view of co-pending Application Nos. 09/707,545, 09/707,700 and 09/707,656, respectively. A terminal disclaimer addressing these co-pending applications is provided herewith, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Paragraph 8 of the Office Action states that Claims 1 - 5 and 8 - 11 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 5,870,611 to London Shrader et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended their independent Claims 1, 8, and 10 herein to more clearly specify that the access rights are a "requester's" access rights. Applicants have also incorporated the elements of dependent Claims 3, 9, and 11, which also specify limitations referring to access rights, into the independent claims. Applicants find no teaching in London Shrader of using access rights. When discussing Claim 3, for example, p. 9 of the Office Action cites col. 5, lines 2 - 6. This text merely describes an environment in which London Shrader's invention may execute. Access rights are not described. When discussing Claim 1, p. 8 of the Office Action cites col. 6, lines 51 - 62 as teaching the limitation that refers to access rights. However, the "unique generated response files for particular workstation" stated in the cited text are not discussed or taught as being in any way related to a potential requester's access rights.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to make out a *prima facie* case of anticipation. Without more, Claims 1 - 2, 4 - 5, 8, and 10 are deemed patentable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §102 rejection.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Paragraph 10 of the Office Action states that Claims 6 - 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over London Shrader in view of U. S. Patent 6,550,057 to Bowman-Amuah. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that London Shrader does not anticipate their independent Claim 1. Thus, Bowman-Amuah cannot be combined with London Shrader to render dependent Claims 6 - 7 obvious. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §103 rejection.

V. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcia L. Doubet

Marcia L. Doubet
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 25260
Phone: 407-343-7586
Fax: 407-343-7587

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (2)